

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 Rejection

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for being anticipated by U. S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0137503 to Roderique. Claim 3, 6, 7, 11, and 15 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roderique in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0009184 to Shnier. Claim 4 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roderique in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,016 to Cronin. Claims 5, 8, 9, 10, 12-14, 16 and 17 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roderique in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,444 to Chen.

Applicants submit that the rejections of claims 1-17 are rendered moot in view of the submitted Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, by the named inventors.

Under § 1.131, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or § 103 based on a patent may, upon a proper showing, be overcome by removing the patent as a reference against the claims. Applicants submit that the §1.131 Declaration submitted herewith is sufficient to remove the Roderique patent publication under the §102(e) rejection and the primary reference of the Roderique patent publication under the §103(a) rejection as references and thus is sufficient to overcome the above-noted rejections.

More specifically, Applicants submit that the §1.131 Declaration is formally and substantively sufficient to establish that the Inventors had completed the invention defined in at least claims 1, 5, 10 and 14 in the United States before the effective date of the Roderique reference, i.e., March 23, 2001. The statements in the Declaration show that the formal requirements of §1.131 are satisfied, namely:

- (1) the rejections to be overcome are under §102(e) and §103(a),

(2) all the acts for completing the invention of claims 1, 5, 10 and 14, and those claims dependent thereon were performed in the United States, and

(3) the effective date of the Roderique (i.e., March 23, 2001) is not more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the statements in the Declaration are also sufficient to satisfy the substantive requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.131. The Declaration sets forth specific facts, of sufficient character and weight, to establish a **date of conception** before March 23, 2001, the effective date of the Roderique reference, and to show that the Inventors and their attorneys exercised **due diligence** from a time before the effective filing date of the Roderique reference to a constructive reduction to practice, i.e., to the filing date of the application in the United States on April 3, 2001.

DATE OF CONCEPTION

As evidenced in the Invention Disclosure, the system and method for a selective call greeting system provides for selectively responding to a caller with one of n greetings as recited in the independent claims.

An IBM Invention Disclosure is submitted with the Declaration as supporting evidence of this prior date of conception. It is respectfully submitted that the Invention Disclosure shows that the Inventors had a definite and permanent idea of the complete and operative invention of all the pending claims 1-17 prior to March 23, 2001, the effective date of the Roderique reference.

In particular, the Invention Disclosure shows the features of independent claims 1, 5, 10 and 14 (and dependent claims). Also, Applicants note that the original Invention Disclosure shows a date antedating the March 23, 2001 effective date of the Roderique reference. This and all other pertinent dates have been removed from the photocopies of the Invention Disclosure submitted with the Declaration to prevent any potential prejudice to Applicants.

Applicants further submit that the Declaration filed herewith shows, unequivocally, that the Inventors had in their possession a definite and permanent idea of the complete and operative invention of the pending claims before March 23, 2001 in a manner sufficient to satisfy the requirements of conception, as set forth in M.P.E.P. §§ 715.07 and 2138.04, and thus constitute *prima facie* evidence of Applicants' date of conception of the invention in this country before the effective date of the Roderique reference.

DUE DILIGENCE

Applicants further submit that the Declaration shows the Inventors and their attorneys exercised due diligence from a time before the March 23, 2001 effective date of the Roderique reference to a constructive reduction to practice, realized by the filing of the above-identified parent application on April 3, 2001 in the United States.

The Invention Disclosure was forwarded to outside counsel in a timely manner prior to the effective date of the Roderique reference. Discussions between the Inventors and counsel took place on several occasions including at least February 16, 2001, March 27, 2001 and March 28, 2001 until a final application was forwarded to the Inventors for execution, and subsequent filing on April 3, 2001.

Counsel acted in an expeditious manner to prepare the application for filing. Under M.P.E.P. §2138.06, only *reasonable* diligence is required in this regard. More specifically, §2138.06 states that a patent attorney will be held to have exercised reasonable diligence if the attorney worked reasonably hard on the application during the critical period, taking into consideration any backlog of unrelated cases the attorney may have had and his completion of those cases along with the present application in chronological order. Applicants respectfully submit that the Declaration shows that counsel acted sufficiently expeditiously to satisfy the requirements of due diligence.

Applicants submit that the Declaration submitted herewith is sufficient to show that due diligence was exercised as required under 37 C.F.R. § 131. The Inventors remained in regular

Serial No.: 09/824,580


contact with counsel to answer questions, provide technical explanation, and supply the supplemental disclosure materials necessary for allowing the application to be filed in an expeditious manner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 1-17 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submits that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, if needed. Applicants hereby make a written conditional petition for extension of time, if required. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to IBM Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Charles J. Gross
Reg. No. 52, 972

Andrew M. Calderon
Reg. No 38,093

McGuireWoods, LLP
Suite 1800
1750 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 712-5341
\\COM414630.1